

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

# NATHANIEL KING

**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

**DALLAS-FORT WORTH §  
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT BOARD, §**

**Defendant.**



**CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:22-CV-929-P**

**DEFENDANT DALLAS-FORT WORTH  
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT BOARD'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Defendant, Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport Board (“DFW”), moves for an order granting summary judgment against Plaintiff Nathaniel King (“Plaintiff”) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.

1. DFW is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's disability discrimination claim because Plaintiff is not a qualified individual.

2. Even if Plaintiff could establish that he was a qualified individual, DFW is still entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's disability discrimination claim because Plaintiff cannot establish a causal connection between his disability and any alleged adverse employment action.

3. Plaintiff's disability discrimination claim also fails to the extent Plaintiff claims DFW allegedly refusing to reassign him constitutes an adverse employment action.

4. DFW is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's retaliation claim because Plaintiff cannot establish a causal connection between his request for accommodation and his administrative termination.

5. Additionally, DFW is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's retaliation claim because Plaintiff cannot establish a causal connection between his request for accommodation and DFW's alleged refusal to reassign him.

6. Plaintiff's retaliation claim also fails to the extent Plaintiff claims DFW allegedly refusing to reassign him constitutes an adverse employment action.

7. Finally, DFW is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's discrimination and retaliation claims because DFW has articulated a legitimate nondiscriminatory, nonretaliatory reason for Plaintiff's administrative termination and Plaintiff cannot sustain his ultimate burden of proof to show DFW's reason for terminating him was pretextual.

8. This Motion is based on the attached Brief in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, the attached summary judgment evidence, and all pleadings and papers on file.

### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, DFW respectfully requests that the Court grant its Motion for Summary Judgment, that Plaintiff's lawsuit be dismissed in its entirety, that the Court award DFW its costs, and that DFW be given all other relief to which it is justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Caroline C. Harrison

Caroline C. Harrison  
State Bar No. 24046034  
[charrison@phamharrison.com](mailto:charrison@phamharrison.com)  
Spencer M. Mainka  
State Bar No. 24116707  
[smainka@phamharrison.com](mailto:smainka@phamharrison.com)  
PHAM HARRISON, LLP  
505 Pecan Street, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(817) 632-6300  
(817) 632-6313 – Fax

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby acknowledges that a true and correct copy of the above-mentioned document was served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on this the 9th day of June, 2023 on counsel for Plaintiff as follows:

Wes Dauphinot  
Law Offices of Wes Dauphinot, P.C.  
900 West Abram  
Arlington, Texas 76103  
[wes@dauphinotlawfirm.com](mailto:wes@dauphinotlawfirm.com)

Hani F. Kobty  
Kobty Law Firm  
900 West Abram  
Arlington, Texas 76103  
[hani@kotbylawfirm.com](mailto:hani@kotbylawfirm.com)

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF**

/s/ Caroline C. Harrison  
Caroline C. Harrison